

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, and 16-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, independent claims 1-7 are amended and claims 16-19 are added. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at Fig. 7 and related descriptions in the specification. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 10, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshida (U.S. Pat. No. 5,172,246) and claims 2, 5, 9, 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshida in view of Beikirch (U.S. Pat. No. 5,532,839). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 4, Applicants respectfully submit that Yoshida and Beikirch, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest a controller provided in a control device, that executes a recovery process to eliminate the acquisition error, when the acquisition error occurs, and the decode error, when the decode error occurs, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 4.

Yoshida discloses the retransmission of the error data frame between a transmitting station and a receiving station. See col. 5, lines 59-64 and Fig. 1 of Yoshida. However, Applicants assert that a complete transmitting and receiving of image data cannot be interpreted as a recovery process as recited in the independent claims. Additionally, Applicants assert that neither the transmitting of image data at a transmitting station nor the receiving of image data at a receiving station alone can be interpreted as the recited process. Although Yoshida discloses that the damaged frame of transmitted image data can be identified, the transmitting station and the receiving station still cannot execute a recovery process to eliminate a decode error based solely on checking CRC errors. Rather, Yoshida simply knows that a segment of the data did not arrive at the desired location.

Further, if the combination of transmitting and receiving of a data frame together is interpreted as the recited process, the transmitting station in Yoshida allegedly controls the predetermined work flow regarding transmitting the image data on a frame-by-frame basis. The receiving station is responsible for checking CRC errors in received data frames and sending the ID of the damaged data frame to the transmitting station. See col. 5, lines 47-66 of Yoshida. However, under this interpretation, Yoshida does not disclose or suggest a controller provided in a control device that determines whether an acquisition error indicating failure in acquiring the document data occurs and whether a decode error indicating failure in decoding the acquired document data occurs, and executes a recovery process to eliminate the acquisition error when the acquisition error occurs and the decode error when the decode error occurs, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 4.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that Beikirch fails to make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Yoshida. In particular, Beikirch merely discloses a digital imaging document handling system that identifies duplicate electronic documents without pixel-by-pixel page image comparisons. See col. 1, lines 6-12. However, Beikirch is silent regarding the above-noted features.

In view of the above, Yoshida and Beikirch, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter as recited in independent claims 1 and 4, which are therefore allowable. Claims 2-3 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 5-7 depend from independent claim 4. Therefore claims 2-3 and 5-7 also define allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections of claims 1-7 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Benjamin B. Mazahery
Registration No. 60,969

JAO:BBM/ccs

Date: November 4, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|